



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES OF CASES.

Duty to Warn Servant—Lightning Not Always Zigzag.—An employee engaged in repairing a pipe line is chargeable with notice of the law of nature that gas arising from crude petroleum rarifies the air and produces a point of light resistance, so that a bolt of lightning descending to the earth will follow the trail of the gas, and that, if he is working at the point of origin of such gas, a pool of oil in which he is standing may be ignited by the lightning; and hence the employer is not required to warn him of such danger. *Butler v. Gulf Pipe Line Co.* (Civ. App.), 144 S. W. 340.

Imputation That White Woman Was Colored as Libel.—In *Jones v. R. L. Polk & Co.* (Ala.), 67 So. 577, the facts showed that the appellant sued appellee in an action of libel for that appellee falsely, maliciously, and with intent to defame her, published of and concerning her in a book known as "Selma City Directory" that appellant was a colored person, etc. The proof was that on page 180 of the directory printed by appellee appellant's name was printed with an asterisk before it. On page 87 of the same book it was shown that an asterisk before a name denoted that the person named was colored. Appellant's name was printed in the same column with a dozen or more Joneses, some of whom were properly designated as colored. Appellant was of pure Caucasian descent. On these facts the judgment of the court below for the appellee was affirmed. Judge Sayre said: "The general statement that a person is 'colored' imputes no crime, no misconduct, no mental, moral, or physical fault for which one may be justly held accountable to public opinion; and yet in the peculiar social conditions prevailing in this jurisdiction, to publish of and concerning a white woman that she is colored, meaning that she is a negro, or has negro blood in her veins, is libelous within the definition of libel commonly found in the books. *Flood v. News & Courier Co.*, 71 S. C. 112, 50 S. E. 637, 4 Ann. Cas. 685. Whether, then, such a publication is libelous in any particular case depends upon circumstances. Here there is room for innocent mistakes. Appellee offered evidence that this asterisk got in front of appellant's name by mistake of the printer hired by it to print its directory, and that immediately upon discovery of the error it was corrected, and on this evidence, under the charge of the court stating the law of the case, the jury acquitted appellee. Appellee's evidence made a case on which it was proper to leave it to the jury to find whether appellee's publication came within the saving of the following principle of the law of libel: The publisher of matter, in its nature calculated to defame and injure another, but not necessarily libelous, must be presumed to have intended to do that which the publication is calculated to bring about, and so must